

REMARKS

The present response is accompanied by a Petition for Revival of an Application for Patent Abandoned Unintentionally under 37 C.F.R. 1.137(b) being filed herewith responsive to the November 12, 2009 Notice of Abandonment in the present patent application.

Claims 63-68, 75-77, 79-81, 83, 86-90, 92 and 120 are currently pending, of which claims 63 and 120 are in independent form. No claims have been amended in this response.

Favorable reconsideration of the present application as currently constituted is respectfully requested.

Regarding the Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 63-68, 76-81, 86, 89-90 and 120 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Motorola AirMobile Wireless Software for Lotus cc:Mail, Version 1.1 (hereinafter *AirMobile*), in view of U.S. Patent 6,636,965 to Beyda et al. (hereinafter the *Beyda* reference), further in view of WyndMail (WyndMail for Windows CE, 1997; hereinafter the *WyndMail* reference), comp.mail.sendmail ("Need to rewrite From Field on outgoing mail, May 23, 1996; hereinafter the *Sendmail* reference)

and U.S. Patent No. 6,571,290 to Selgas et al. (hereinafter the Selgas reference).

Additionally, claim 75 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over AirMobile, Beyda, WyndMail, Sendmail and U.S. Patent No. 6,138,146 to Moon et al. (hereinafter the Moon reference); claims 83, 87 and 88 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over AirMobile, Beyda, WyndMail, Sendmail and U.S. Patent No. 6,745,230 to Cao et al. (hereinafter the Cao reference); and claim 92 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over AirMobile, Beyda, WyndMail, Sendmail and U.S. Patent No. 6,076,241 to Zondervan (hereinafter the Zondervan reference).

The Examiner has commented as follows in respect of the rejection of claim 63:

Regarding claim 63, AirMobile shows

. . .

AirMobile does not explicitly show a 1st and a 2nd address. AirMobile additionally shows where the forwarding to the wireless director is via a local area network connection between the messaging host system and the wireless redirector host system, but does not show where said local area network connection is instead a wide area network connection.

Beyda shows where email servers can be accessed over local area network connections or wide area network connections, include where said email servers are involved in forwarding messages (col. 2 lines 38-63), thus disclosing where the forwarding to the

wireless director is Via a wide area network connection between the messaging host system and the wireless redirector host system.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the disclosure of AirMobile with that of Beyda in order to encompass a wider variety of messages processing system configurations, thus providing for additional flexibility in implementing the disclosed method/system.

. . .

Additionally, base claim 120 appears to be rejected based on the same reasoning.

Applicant respectfully traverses the above §103(a) rejections and offers the following as support. Base claim 63 is directed to an embodiment of a method of redirecting data messages between a messaging host system and a wireless mobile communication device. As currently constituted, the claimed embodiment includes, *inter alia*, forwarding a copy of the data message from the messaging host system to a wireless redirector host system via a wide area network connection between the messaging host system and the wireless redirector host system. The wireless redirector host system then transmits the data message to the wireless mobile device on determining that the data message should be forwarded.

The rejection admits that AirMobile does not disclose or suggest that forwarding to the wireless director is via a wide area network. Applicant respectfully submits that *Beyda* is of no avail with regard to curing this deficiency of *AirMobile*. While *Beyda* appears to disclose that an email server may be connected to a user's personal computer via a wide area network, *Beyda* does not disclose or suggest that messages are forwarded to a redirector program via this wide area network. Rather, *Beyda* appears to disclose an email server that receives an email from a sender and sends that email to the addressees, but to no other addressees. *Beyda* is directed to the ability to include comments in an email, with the comments being received and viewable by some, but not all, of the recipients. *Beyda* uses the word "forward" five times, according to the text of the issued patent on the USPTO website. In one reference to forwarding, the sender forwards a message and a list of recipients to the message processor, e.g., an email server. In each of the other references, the message processor forwards either the message or the additional comments to the designated recipients. The message server of *Beyda* does not receive a message addressed to a user associated with the messaging system and forward the message to an address that is not listed as a recipient, such as a

redirector system. Thus, *Beyda* does not suggest **forwarding** a message once that message has reached an intended recipient. Accordingly, the *Beyda* reference does not cure the deficiency of *AirMobile* with respect to forwarding a copy of the data message from the messaging host system to a wireless redirector system via a wide area network connection, as suggested by the rejection.

The remaining references, e.g., *WyndMaili*, *Sendmail*, *Moon*, *Cao* and *Zondervan*, are of no avail in overcoming this deficiency of *AirMobile* and *Beyda* with respect to forwarding a copy of the data message from the messaging host system to a wireless redirector system via a wide area network connection, nor has the Examiner suggested that they do so.

At least for the foregoing reasons, the applied references, either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest all the limitations of the pending base claims 63 and 120 as currently constituted. It is therefore believed that base claims 63 and 120 are in condition for allowance. Dependent claims 64-68, 76-81 and 89-90 depending from base claim 63 are also allowable over the applied art of record at least for the same reasons.

Reservation of Rights

Notwithstanding the foregoing, Applicant reserves all rights not exercised in connection with this response, such as, e.g., the right to challenge or rebut any tacit or explicit characterization of any reference, Applicant's prior responses or of the present claims, the right to challenge any Official Notice(s) taken, the right to challenge or rebut any asserted factual or legal basis of any of the rejections of the present Office Action, or the right to swear behind any cited reference such as provided under 37 C.F.R. §1.131 or otherwise.

Fee Statement

Compared to the highest number previously paid for, the total number of claims and the number of independent claims has not increased. Applicant is filing herewith a Petition for Revival of an Application for Patent Abandoned Unintentionally under 37 C.F.R. 1.137(b). Applicable fees are being paid via electronic filing. If any additional fees are due or any overpayments have been made, however, please charge or credit our deposit account (Deposit Account No. 03-1130).

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

In view of the fact that none of the art of the record, whether considered alone or in combination discloses, anticipates or suggests the pending claims, and in further view of the above amendments and/or remarks, reconsideration of the Action and allowance of the present patent application are respectfully requested and are believed to be appropriate.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: January 29, 2010

/Betty Formby/
Betty Formby
Registration No. 36,536

THE DANAMRAJ LAW GROUP, P.C.
Premier Place, Suite 1450
5910 North Central Expressway
Dallas, Texas 75206
Tel (214) 750-5666
Fax (214) 363-8177